DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 296 UD 018 620

AUTHOR Borman, Kathryn M.; And Others
TITLE Characteristics of Family and Classroom Control in an Urban Appalachian Neighborhood.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 28, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Rearing; Class Management; *Cultural Factors; *Discipline; *Family Background; Family Role; Interaction Process Analysis; Kindergarten Children; Lower Class Parents; Lower Class Students; Primary Education; Regional Characteristics; Rural to Urban Migration; Rural Urban Differences; Student Behavior; *Teaching Styles; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachians

ABSTRACT

Data collected from observations of a kindergarten class, and parent interviews with second and third generation Appalachian families living in an inner city working class neighborhood, when contrasted with Melvin Kohn's work on values, illuminate the discontinuity between the language of social control in the home and at school. Appalachian families' parental control strategies, sex roles in child rearing, and standards of behavior do not conform to those of non-Appalachian working class families. Like middle class parents, Appalachian parents value independence and self direction rather than obedience to authority. The teacher's control of the Appalachian children in a classroom is most effective when it is child referenced rather than authority-centered. Future classroom research must consider cultural and ethnic factors, social class, and other family background variables of the children being observed, rather than focusing solely on the role teachers and schools have in maintaining classroom control. (KR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159296

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILY AND CLASSROOM CONTROL IN AN URBAN APPALACHIAN NEIGHBORHOOD *

Kathryn M. Borman,
Nancy S. Lippincott,
Christopher M. Matey and Phillip Obermiller

University of Cincinnati

Paper Presented at The American Educational Research Association
March 28, 1978
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn Borman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UD018620

Enclaved groups of urban minorities often remain isolated from schools though the school itself is a prominant fixture in the local neighborhood. A major factor contributing to this isolation is that teachers, though they may be committed and caring, speak another language than that spoken by parents and children in the neighborhood. Though both groups may claim the English language as their common mother tongue, problems of communication persist because underlying value systems are vastly different. A child's family may use one language of social control to manage the child and his teacher another that is widely variant. The family may appeal to the child in terms of his or her relationship with others while the teacher may use control strategies that make reference to institutional norms. Ultimately the child becomes familiar with the school's code and skilled at operating within its control context; the school may simultaneously make adaptations to the value systems of its students. However, the discontinuity between family and school control systems could be most troublesome for young elementary aged children and their teachers.

Appalachian Values and the Urban Experience

An ethnic minority particularly isolated from social institutions generally and the schools specifically are urban Appalachians. (Wagner, 1977) The research of Jerome Pickard (1974) documents the migration of some seven million people from the predominantly rural counties of Appalachia to the more heavily industrialized areas of the Northeastern and Great Lakes states. A strong blue-collar ethos, neighborhood orientation, and kinship affiliation characterize the lives of these people who in some cases remain enclaved in central-city neighborhoods for two or three generations after the initial in-migration of parents or grandparents.

---

*The research was partially supported by a grant from the University of Cincinnati Research Council.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Sandra Bauman in data collection, Dan McKee in data analysis, and Jane Shreve in typing the final manuscript. The authors also thank Jeffrey Shultz and Roger Woock for comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

Appalachian cultural values seem to remain intact in the urban setting. Batteau (1977) found that, despite certain adaptations in the face of the "modernizing" influence of city living, the Appalachian kinship system continues to represent a "unique configuration" within the context of American society. Schwartzweller et al (1971) noted that the kinship networks of Appalachian migrants supported a set of moving-in strategies which were particularly effective in allowing newcomers to make a successful passage from hill to city living. Especially notable were informal systems among neighborhood-based kin groups for finding employment, locating housing, and providing social and psychological support for new settlers.

Although the internal social order of the Appalachian neighborhood reinforces hill values of egalitarianism and independence through traditional patterns of familial self-help, the hierarchic values of the external urban social system also affect city-dwelling Appalachians. In this regard they have much in common with other urban poor and working class groups. The research done by McKee and Obermiller (1978) demonstrates that Appalachians living in the five largest metropolitan areas in Ohio tend to be found concentrated in poor and working class neighborhoods in the cities studied.

John Stephenson's (1968) study of daily life in a small Appalachian town focused upon the impact of factory employment and resettlement in the town of Shiloh upon the value systems of family groups. Stephenson identified both a modern and a traditional value orientation among Shiloh residents. Though both groups valued familism, the traditional sub-culture was more strict in its allegiance to kin-group, whereas the modern subculture was inclined also to identify with "occupation, place of residence, and educational status... a man is not only Creech Gilliams' son, he is also and perhaps mainly a well-to-do contractor." (Stephenson, 1968:133) Stephenson dismisses social class as the critical variable in explaining these different orientations: "The imperfect relationship among factors such as perceived social level, occupation, neighborhood, and value orientations... indicates that a class conception of the social structure of Shiloh is too tight and too simple... as informants tried to express it when they said the class system was fluid."(Stephenson, 1968:27) The typology of families used by Stephenson to discuss his results is derived from consideration of perceived status level, occupation, and values. Though Stephenson asserts that his is "not just another stratification study,"

his modern families include only those whose heads were employed in white collar jobs while his traditional group were blue collar employed. However, there were a number of mobile groups who could not be placed firmly in one category or the other and whose allegiances were to a mixed set of modern and traditional values and behaviors. Stephenson speculates that in Shiloh a folk culture may not have declined in terms of its hold upon "modernists" but simply that a template of urban values may have been acquired as an overlay (Stephenson, 1968:27).

Persistent Appalachian values represented by strong kinship and neighborhood ties, far from being culturally derived "fatal flaws," are probably best seen as survival strategies much akin to the culturally coherent tactics for survival developed by other ethnic minorities. However, the conflict of Appalachian values and urban social values may function to keep second and third generation urban Appalachians from having economic and social options which parents may, in fact, desire for their children.

Although social class in itself may not determine the values one acquires, it is certainly strongly associated with some of the individual's most fundamental notions of himself and his world. From an early age, children are aware of social status differences between themselves and others. Moreover, their life circumstances have a direct and measurable effect upon children's behavior. Jerome Kagan reports that by 20 to 29 months of age, "the class of the child's family had become a major predictor of attentiveness, vocalization, and smiling", behaviors of considerable importance in the child's cognitive and social functioning. (Kagan, 1978:48) Circumstances of poverty also have an effect upon personality development. By the age of 10, a lower class child has come to "question his ability to possess the talents and instrumental competencies that the middle class child commands." (Ibid :49)

Parental values are influential in the process of the child's development. These values are shaped by the parent's social and occupational experience and so are linked to the parent's ethnicity and social class but also are influenced by other environmental factors such as religion and region. These environmental effects interact with constitutional factors in ways as yet mysterious to psychologists and sociologists. Our current knowledge of the origins of values and the effects of values upon child rearing attitudes and behaviors owes much to the work of Melvin Kohn (1969). His research has

persuasively illustrated the variation in values, ideologies and belief systems which exist across the spectrum of social classes.

Kohn has argued that in working class families, parental values are likely to emphasize conformist behavior as the standard for children. Parents valuing conformity stress to children the importance of cleanliness, honesty, good manners and the like rather than emphasizing studiousness, responsibility and curiosity. Traditional values are manifest in the form of social control used by parents to regulate the ongoing or future behavior of their children. Punishment in the form of spanking, the abrupt curtailment of privileges, or the cold ignoring of the offensive child prevails over verbal controls. When verbal controls <u>are</u> used by parents, they are phrased as blunt commands rather than as reasoned appeals.

Schools and Mobility

In contrast to the working class family, the neighborhood school has been seen as a context for mobility training. That is, teachers, many of whom are middle class, encourage the development of competencies required for success in middle class occupations. That schools in impoverished neighborhoods provide this mobility training has seemed doubtful to many recent critics of the school. (See for example, Spring, 1976) According to their accounts, schools foster the acquisition of values such as punctuality and idea conformity which socialize working class children in preparation for work in factories or at back breaking jobs similar to those held by their parents. However, observers of the schools who have used a normative, functionalist perspective for interpreting the process of schooling emphasize the prevailing liberal ideology inherent in the public school's stated curriculum and the inculcation of middle class values of self control and individual achievement accomplished through the school's hidden curriculum. These contradictory analyses of the school point up what may be divergent functions harbored by <u>all</u> schools; on the one hand, the training of the liberal citizen and competent individual, on the other, the socialization of the child in conformity through strict adherence to schedules, the management of classroom time and so forth.

A serious examination of schooling is needed to determine which of the two functions of the school, the liberating or the socializing, predominates in children's day to day classroom experience. Our research was undertaken to

examine the socializing or social control function of schooling by studying the kindergarten classroom life of a group of children from working class families who lived in an urban Appalachian neighborhood. We recorded and examined the teacher's social control patterns as they were revealed in her day to day conversation with children in the classroom. The teacher's mode of social control was seen as critical since teachers are the negotiators of the school's dual mission to educate and socialize; they are charged with the making of the liberal citizen and the punctual student/worker. Since these children were kindergarten students experiencing their first formal schooling, we wished to determine whether teacher methods of social control were congruent with family social control practices experienced by children at home.

Method

The Sample

Subjects for this study came from an inner-city working class, predominantly Appalachian neighborhood called Lower Price Hill. All of these families had at least one child of elementary school age and most had more than one. In addition, all of the families had grandparents or parents from the Appalachian region. Most of the respondents themselves, however, had been born and raised in Lower Price Hill. Altogether, twenty-four parents were interviewed, including nine couples and six single parents. Of this group, two individuals completed high school, fourteen had less than an eighth grade education and eight had stopped their studies sometime between the ninth and eleventh grade. Twelve individuals were unemployed and the remainder were employed either as service workers or laborers. All were under 45 years of age.

The children in this study came from the kindergarten class of the neighborhood school. There were twenty-three children enrolled in the class. Some of the children were sons and daughters of interviewed parents. The remaining children came from similar homes. After a four week observation period in the classroom, three boys and three girls were selected for study. These children were judged by their teacher to have social, intellectual and communication skills in a range that was "typical" for children in the kindergarten of this school. Later assessment of IQ with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) indicated an overall average score of 103 with a range in scores of 24 points.

Sex differences were not apparent. The six children served as conversation markers of the recorded classroom activities.

Families for the study were selected primarily through the "grapevine" technique (Rubin, 1976). Names of families with at least one elementary school child were provided by various community sources, including the parents themselves.

The Interview

Each family on the "grapevine" lists was contacted by one of two teams of researchers. Each research team had a male and a female. The team contacted the families in their home, explained the nature of the study, and asked if they wished to participate. If the family were willing to cooperate, the interviewers set up a convenient time to complete the questionnaire. The female interviewer questioned the wife, recording her answers on the interview schedule. The male interviewer did the same with the husband. Single parents were interviewed by an interviewer of the same sex. Since the answers were multiple choice or short answer, the interviews were not tape recorded. If possible, however, husbands and wives were interviewed in separate rooms.

Items included in the interview schedule measured values and attitudes toward 1) occupation, 2) child rearing practices, 3) family interaction, 4) ethnic background and identification with the urban Appalachian experience, 5) local neighborhood, and 6) personal adjustment, especially in regard to self-control and self-confidence. The items were principally derived from similar survey work done by Kohn (1969) on occupation, child rearing practices, and orientation to society, by Mangalem and his colleagues (1971) on ethnic background and identification with the urban Appalachian experience, and by Warren (1976) on attitudes toward local community. All respondents had at least one male child in one of the primary grades of school (K-3). Parents were asked to respond to questions on child discipline with reference to their young school-age son. The interview consisted of 180 questions and took 1½ hours to complete.

Classroom Observation

In order to assess how the teacher and the students used language to achieve social control, tape recordings of the kindergarten classroom were made between March and June of the school year. The tapes were collected on a Sony BM-11 Secutive 100 tape recorder, which is a relatively unobtrusive tape recorder.

Children soon became used to it and did not seem to alter their behavior because of it. Field notes kept by an observer supplemented transcriptions of tape recorded activities.

Tapes were made in a variety of settings in order to capture the range of situations in which both children and teacher were apt to regulate ongoing or future behavior. The sample for this study included transcripts of nine sessions: two of reading groups, three of table-work activities, and five of pegboard math, all of which were events carried out with the teacher's supervision.

In subsequent analyses, the regulative conversations recorded on the transcripts were divided into utterance units and marked according to whether an initiating utterance elicited a response (SI) or did not (UI). Regulative conversations included all verbal utterances (and any accompanying non-verbal gestures) used by the teacher to control ongoing or future behavior of children and any subsequent verbal or non-verbal responses related to the teacher's regulative bid. Each regulative statement was further coded according to its type: hard imperative, soft imperative, declarative and so on. Responses were also coded in terms of their message contents: assent, refusal, rejection, ignore, appropriate verbal or behavioral response, and so on.

Results and Discussion

Patterns of Family Control

Parental Control Strategies

Family control involves parental responses to their children's misbehaviors. Parents were presented a set of child-discipline problems and asked to explain what their response to the child in each set of circumstances would be. As an example, parents were asked if their child ever fought with his brothers or sisters. If the parent responded affirmatively, the parent was asked to recall and describe examples of this behavior and to describe his or her response to the behavior. These problems were identical to those used by Kohn to elicit parental modes of child control.

Insert Table 1 about here

In the present sample, parents tended to agree with one another in terms of how a given situation would be handled such that if one parent mentioned spanking as an appropriate disciplinary strategy, the other parent was likely to offer the same opinion. The parents' judgment of an offense as serious or

trivial was determined by the severity of the punishment meted out by the parent. Thus, as reported in Table 1, parents were likely to spank the child for fighting with his brothers and sisters but were inclined to negotiate the situation verbally with the child when he refused to do as he had been told. Thus, parents saw their child's disobedient behavior as a less serious misdemeanor than the child's physical or verbal attacks upon siblings.

These parents were similar to Kohn's working class sample in their rank ordering of offenses from more to less serious in nature. However, urban Appalachian parents reported less frequent use of physical punishment in disciplining the child than did Kohn's working class sample and only slightly more than the amount indicated by Kohn's middle class respondents.

In addition to spanking or whipping for more serious offenses, parents also reported using other strategies for less serious behaviors. Minor offenses were handled by giving the child a "talking to" or, less threateningly, by "talking it over" with the child. Restraining the child's activity by making him sit down, sending him to his room or withholding privileges was also mentioned. Some parents offered monetary bribes in response to less serious offenses such as disobeying the parent by refusing to go to school. Parents reported ignoring the child who had lost his temper.

Several hypothetical situations involving the child were described to parents who were then asked what their reaction to the child would be. In response to the question of how they would handle their son if he picked flowers from a neighbor's yard to give as a gift to the parent, parents were divided in their decisions to praise, spank, verbally discipline the child or make him apologize. Some stated that though they would thank the child for the gift and praise his thoughtfulness, a whipping and an apology to the neighbor would follow in short order as a disciplinary measure.

Parental Roles

Married parents were asked a number of questions probing their perceptions of themselves and their spouses' roles in child rearing. Like Kohn's middle class parents but unlike his working class group the parents in our sample took an active role in child rearing: fathers and mothers were both perceived as participating in the child rearing process and as giving support to the child. In response to the question of how frequently the parent displayed

affection toward the child, both mothers and fathers indicated that they demonstrated their love by hugging or kissing the child frequently during the course of a typical week. They also indicated that they were likely to get angry or upset with the child quite frequently during the same period. To assess the degree of support given to the child by the parent, we asked parents to describe what they were likely to do when the child did something to please them. We also asked married parents to judge which parent was quicker to praise the child for doing well. Parents indicated they would praise their children for good behavior and also stated they would reward such behavior with money. Parents saw spouses either as equally quick to praise or quicker to praise the child. Parents were also asked to name the individual to whom the child turned when he needed to talk something over. In fourteen of nineteen cases, parents reported the child equally likely to talk to either parent or both parents together in such circumstances. The remaining five cases were split two and two between mother or father as a first choice with one fifth respondent reporting neither parent as the child's usual first choice. Parents were asked to whom the child would turn when unhappy or upset. The mother was named in twelve instances with both parents as the perceived choice in the remaining seven cases.

In summary, parents see both themselves and their spouses as actively involved in supportive relationships with their children who, in turn, actively seek support from both parents. This profile of high involvement resembles that reported by Kohn for middle class parents included in his national sample.

Parental Values

Though strategies for control and patterns of parental role, including parental supportiveness, differed from those mentioned by Kohn's working class respondents and were, in fact, more similar to those reported by his middle class group, values in terms of traits considered important in the behavior of their grade school child were quite similar to those held by Kohn's working class parents with one important exception. From his analysis of the responses of working class and middle class parents, Kohn concluded that though all parents emphasized honesty, obedience, responsibility and consideration, middle class parents were, in addition, more likely to prize children's self direction while working class parents emphasized conformity to external

authority. His conclusions were based on the finding that middle class parents gave greater emphasis to self control, interest in how and why things happen, and consideration and that working class parents attached greater weight to obedience and neatness.

Urban Appalachian parents in our sample were most concerned with the external behavior of their children, as indicated in Table 2. However, though they stressed the importance of good manners, cleanliness and friendliness to an even greater extent that Kohn's working class parents, they were only slightly more disposed than Kohn's college educated middle class to see obedience to parents as crucial. Children's obedience to authority relative to other behaviors is held in low esteem. It should be recalled (See Table 1) that these parents considered disobedience in terms of a refusal to comply with a parent's demands as the least serious of a number of behaviors for which the child might be disciplined. It may be that parents consider children's compliance to external control, their own authority as in this case, to be a character flaw or weakness. Though parents desire that their children be civil in their behavior (have good manners) and honest, conformity in terms of obedience to authority is not prized. This finding may be explained in terms of persistent Appalachian values of independence and individuality. Of course, the small size of the interview group precludes a consideration of these findings as definitive of the experience of urban Appalachian families.[1] Nonetheless, one important point follows from the preceding discussion. Patterns of family child rearing practices including parental methods of controlling children, roles in child rearing and values held as standards for children's behavior do not conform to Kohn's profile of working class families, though parents in our study were working class in terms of their current or recent employment and education levels. Large scale replication of Kohn's research confirms what the data reported here suggests. (See Wright and Wright, 1976). Ethnicity, region and religion are among the other important environmental factors which along with social class must be taken into account in any discussion of child rearing practices and underlying value systems. The less frequent use of physical punishment, the nurturant roles taken by both parents in child rearing, and the lack of emphasis upon obedience to authority differentiate these working class urban Appalachian parents from the expected norm.

- - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 About Here
- - - - - - - - -

Patterns of Classroom Control

The kindergarten aged child may be more compliant than an older child simply because young children generally impute authority to adults, particularly adults in positions of power as teachers, principals, doctors, and the like. Nonetheless, the child's experience in formal school settings with large numbers of other children present, an imposed activity structure and so forth, stands in marked contrast to the child's experience in the family setting.

The authority of the teacher is problematic in that it must be frequently negotiated with the subordinates in the situation - the students in the classroom whom the teacher seeks to control. If children come to school valuing authority and seeing it as inherent in the person in charge, "effective" control strategies would be those making explicit references to the teacher's authority such as appeals for good behavior which include a reference to the thoughts, needs or feelings of the teacher as well as control strategies such as commands with no appeal which simply take the authority of the control agent for granted. If, however, children come from family contexts such as those described above where obedience to authority is not highly valued, the teacher may not be so successful if she or he relies upon the authority of her/his status in the classroom to gain control. Instead, appeals that shift the responsibility for behavior away from the authority figure and to the child may be more effective particularly if the child has learned at home to value individuality.

In order to analyze the teacher's control patterns, a number of full length transcriptions of three regularly occurring classroom events were studied. These three events were selected for study because they varied in terms of focus and leadership and in terms of the number of group participants in the event, factors which influenced the nature of children's conversational interactions. Children in the reading group activity were controlled by the teacher and had reduced opportunities for interaction both because of the teacher's central position in the group and because such activity involved the participation of half of the class. Children in task-focused pegboard math had the most opportunity for interaction because the activity was always performed by a dyad who did their work in a remote area of the classroom and

had to share resources in order to complete the task successfully. Finally, as an intermediate situation, children in the child-initiated activity of table work involved themselves in interaction less often than in task-focused pegboard math but more often than in teacher-focused reading work.

Other, more subjective, criteria differentiated these classroom events. Reading group work had the stigma of the daily grind attached to it. The teacher regarded it as her "dues paying" gesture to the established curriculum for all kindergarten children enrolled in the city's public school system. Table work and pegboard math, on the other hand, were activities structured by the teacher herself in congruence with what she perceived to be the interests of children in the classroom. This teacher was particularly concerned to encourage children to work independently, take responsibility for their own work, and seek her out after a unit of work, generally completed during a period lasting from 15 to 30 minutes on a given morning, had been finished. Though the metaphor of the straw boss and the work gang might seem the appropriate one to apply to the structure of work and work roles in this classroom, the long-term observer of the interactions, the sensibility of the teacher, the involvement of the children, and numerous other details of classroom life would take away a different picture. Children involved in "work jobs" were intensely interested in the task at hand and by the spring had internalized the procedure for selecting a project, taking it to a table or a place on the floor, completing the task and fetching the teacher to approve the finished array once the project had been completed.

Teacher controls were analyzed in terms of the control strategies used by the teacher and the subsequent success of a particular strategy in eliciting an appropriate response from the child (or children) being controlled in the interaction. In addition, characteristics of each interaction were documented and analyzed so as to discover which particular aspects of group size and social control patterns might be associated with the teacher's effectiveness.

The teacher in this classroom enjoyed marked success in regulating children's behavior. Fully two-thirds of all recorded interactions in which she was sole control agent evoked an appropriate response to her control effort regardless of the strategy or set of strategies articulated in her initial control statements. However, certain control strategies were more frequently

employed by the teacher in regulating children's behavior. The most frequently used teacher strategies over-all were control statements that did not include a specific contingency or appeal attached to the request, command, etc., voiced by the teacher. Within this large group of 506 strategies, three types of controls were identified after a content analysis was performed on all recorded data.

There were 168 recorded uses of strategies which were identified as "ritual cues or signals." This was the category of control statement most often utilized by the teacher. Of this number, 121 or 72% of the total were associated with an appropriate response by the child or children being controlled. These attention-getters/cues were succinct, to the point, and almost ritualized in their contents. The following example was recorded in the context of the initial procedure of setting up the reading group meeting:

Teacher: Okay, Group II.

(Group II members move to the area in front of the fireplace to assemble for reading)

Ritual cues/signals were usually accompanied by some non-verbal gestures which had communicative value. For example, the utterance "Okay, there you go" was spoken by the teacher to one of the participants in a pegboard math activity in conjunction with a movement indicating that the child should pick up a wooden block and move it to the center of the table. The probable reason for the usual success of this strategy in eliciting an appropriate response from the child is the reinforcement typically given to the brief verbal message by the teacher's nonverbal behavior.

A set of strategies used almost as frequently as cues/signals and with a similar pattern of success in regulating behavior was the "soft imperative". Soft imperatives typically were suggestions, questions, granting permission and the like that were characterized by their focus upon the child. Of the 162 soft imperatives utilized by the teacher, 109 or 67% were associated with children's subsequent appropriate nonverbal or verbal behavior. The following examples were recorded in the context of reading group. Soft imperatives are in italics:

Example 1: Teacher: Remember where we turn when we get our books?
L: Yeah, where the markers are.
Teacher: Where the markers are. Okay.

Example 2: Teacher: Christine, what word are we working on? Right here. What's the word? What did Danny say it was?
C: Me
Teacher: Me. Okay, good. Now what's the next word?

The orientation to the child is even more marked in the contexts of table work and pegboard math in which the soft imperative was used:

Example 3: Teacher: What do you want to write on the inside of your card? What do you want to say? "I love you" or something? I could write that on the board for you.
K: I'll just write my name. Write "I love you". Write "I love you."
Teacher: What? "I love you?" Okay. What I'll do, I'll write it on a piece of paper and put it on the board so you can copy it. Okay?
K: All right.

Example 4: Teacher: Why don't you set up the board. I think...if you would use more than one board you wouldn't run into trouble 'cause you keep adding pegs here and then it gets kind of confusing. Why don't you set up six plus six on this board and find out.
P: Six plus six.
J: Okay

Example 5: Teacher: Okay, do you know how to make a twenty?
(Boys giggle)
Teacher: How are you going to find out?
P: On that. (pointing to number line)
Teacher: Okay.

Though soft imperatives strongly imply a no-nonsense orientation on the part of the teacher and the expectation that the request, suggestion, etc. will be

followed, soft imperatives leave more room for negotiation often through an appeal to the child in the form of a question than "hard imperatives", commands and the like which were less often used.

Commands, and other hard imperatives, though effective in gaining a response at about the same rate as cues/signals and soft imperatives, tended to be used less often to initiate regulative interactions. Hard imperatives are directives that leave no room for negotiation. A total of 105 appeared in the teacher's initiating control statements. Of this number, 75 or 71% of the total gained an appropriate response. The following examples were taken from the reading group transcripts:

Example 1: (Shannon has picked up a book while the reading group is assembling)

Teacher: Shannon, now wait a minute.

(Shannon holds book but does not open it

The above example illustrates a successful use of the command. The example that follows illustrates an unsuccessful use of the command. The behavior of D and S is inappropriate, hence the strategy used by the teacher has not been used successfully.

Example 2: Teacher: What's the word? Look at the word everybody.

D: I know it.

S: (reading from book) See me, See me, See me

Commands, abrupt demands or threats are likely to occur in classroom context in which children are engaged in activities, which, like finger painting or other art or craft work, demand close attention to detail with any lapse likely to result in spilled paint or a ruined project. The following interaction occurred during a finger painting episode:

Example 3: (teacher is directing a student's finger painting)

Teacher: Just a little bit more. Spread it out. Spread it out just a little bit more

(Child continues to work)

Teacher: Whoops! Spread it out. This a-way. Get it all over. Get it in the corners. (Pause) Get it up there in that corner. (Child does)

Finally, as the following example illustrates, teachers may use hard imperatives as a last resort, annoyed or frustrated at a child's lack of interest, own

frustration, etc.

Example 4: (Child complains about pegboard work)

S: I can't do it

Teacher: All right. Now. Yes, you can. Okay, put some pegs on that side. (S. does)

Teacher: All right. Make a five. Can you do that?

S: I can't.

Teacher: One, two, three, four, five.

S: I can make a two and a five.

Teacher: Okay.

A second finding was that certain contexts of control were more likely to elicit appropriate responses to the teacher's social control strategies. The teacher was the sole control agent in the majority (62%) of recorded cases. In the remainder, the teacher and one or more of the children uttered control statements. When the teacher as the sole control agent interacted with two children as her conversation partners (as in a Triad, Table 3), a group configuration which typified the pegboard math context, she was highly successful in gaining a response to all her regulative bids. Her pattern of control on these circumstances approached statistical significance ($X = 6.97$; $p = .07$). Very few of this teacher's observed or recorded interactions involved her in interaction with the full classroom of children. Only one daily occurring classroom event, the opening attendance-taking, flag saluting and Pledge singing ceremony, involved the participation of all the children organized as a full classroom group, occupying a single, task-focused space at the same time. This activity was not studied in the reported research. The rest of the day was organized so that children took part in activities in groups of two to seven in size. Most of the interactions reported in Table 3 involved intermediate sized groups of between three and seven conversation participants including the teacher. Though the teacher held her own, gaining appropriate responses to her regulative bids the majority of the time regardless of the group size, she enjoyed marked success in the pegboard math context. This finding strengthens other results reported elsewhere (Borman, 1978, forthcoming) from the same data which portray pegboard math as the context most likely of the three (reading group, table work and pegboard math) to foster interaction with an overriding instructional or task-focused purpose.

Conclusion

It is difficult to compare the two different sets of data - those for the parents and those for the classroom which we have reported here. Though both sets focus upon patterns of social control they do so as a result of extremely divergent data gathering methods. Parents' data constituted their responses to a set of questions asked during the course of a structured interview that among others included the items reported here on parental attitudes and behaviors with regard to child rearing. The crucial question regarding these data is with their validity. How accurate a picture these data give of actual child rearing practices remains an unanswered question - one we mean to address in the near future.

No such validity questions arise in connection with the classroom data. Unlike parents' data, these consist of recordings and field notes which were gathered during a period of intensive observation by observers who virtually lived in the classroom for three months.

There is another problem. This has to do with the degree to which six year old children have incorporated their parents' value systems into their own value constructs. Piaget in The Moral Judgment of the Child (1961) describes the child of this age as grounded in a morality of constraint typified by its rigidity, lack of reciprocity and high regard for authority. Kohlberg's description of this same aged child is of an individual locked into a punishment/reward orientation which governs his judgments of what constitutes moral behavior. To put it succinctly, we have no way of knowing what level of moral functioning is characteristic of these children. Though we suspect that like most five and six year olds theirs is a morality of constraint, the question still remains of to what extent a child's system of morality or of values generally is influenced by his level of maturity as opposed to his family's values. The important thing is that we assume that children come to expect adults to employ certain social control strategies and that they take these expectations about the nature of adult social control with them into the classroom.

Despite these difficulties, it is compelling to compare the two sets of data and attempt to arrive at some overall conclusions. First, although the

working class urban Appalachian family is traditional in its approach to child rearing to the extent that children in this family context are spanked for fighting with siblings, talked to when disobedient and so forth and that values such as manners and neatness are prized, the same family resembles Kohn's college educated middle class in its rejection of obedience to authority as a quality highly valued for its children. Children, in turn, having incorporated their parents values, would be likely to reject control strategies at home and presumably elsewhere that demanded unquestioned adherence to an authoritarian code of "Do it because I say so". Finally, children socialized in the family to be responsive to certain social control patterns in that context, embark upon their initial experience in a formal socialization setting - the school. Teachers with their own value sets and predispositions for certain control strategies may or may not find themselves at odds with children, in that teachers may or may not be receptive to children's values and behavior codes. These children's values appear to have influenced their teacher's behavior. The classroom code is congruent with the family code. Child-referenced rather than authority involving appeals are more likely to be used by the teacher to gain an appropriate response from children.

If the model we have just portrayed is an accurate description of linkages between the family and the classroom, those of us engaged in classroom research must be very careful to explain our models of classroom management and control with reference tothe social class, ethnicity, and other family background variables of the children who constitute the student population of the classroom. Analyses of classroom management and control which focus solely or predominantly upon the teacher and other school authorities in their roles as rule makers and maintainers but which ignore the role children themselves play in this process are sadly incomplete.

Note

[1]The work reported here is exploratory. A longitudinal study of the children observed in the kindergarten classroom is being carried out in order to document over time the effects of school experience upon a cohort of children. Observations will also be conducted within the homes of these children.

REFERENCES

BATTEAU, A. (1977) - Modernization: "Inflections in The Appalachian Kinship System."

BORMAN, K. "Children's situational competence: two studies," to appear in O. Garnica (ed.), Language, Children and Society. Pergamon Press, forthcoming.

KAGAN, J. (1977) "The Child in the family," pp. 33-56 in A. S. Rossi, J. Kagan and T.K. Harever, (eds.), The Family, New York: W. W. Norton.

KOHN, M. (1969) Class and Conformity: A study in values. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

McKEE, D. & OBERMILLER, D. (1978) Urban Appalachians of Ohio: A comparison of Akron, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton & Toledo. Cincinnati: The U. Of C.

PIAGET, J. (1965) The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York: The Free Press.

PICKARD, J. (1974) Population changes and trends in Appalachia. Columbus: Academy for Contemporary Problems.

RUBIN, L. (1976) Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working Class Family New York: Basic Books.

SCHWARTZWELLER H. et al. (1971) Mountain Families in Transition. University Park: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

SPRING, J. (1976) The Sorting Machine. New York; McKay.

STEPEHENSON, J. (1968) Shiloh: A Mountain Community. Lexington: University of Kentucky.

WAGNER, T. (1977) Urban schools and Appalachian Children." Urban Education (October): 283-296.

WARREN, R. (1976) The Neighborhood Observation Form. Detroit: Oakland University

WRIGHT, J. D. and S.R. Wright. (1976) "Social Class and parental values for children: A partial replication and extension of the Kahn thesis." American Sociological Review. (June): 527-537.

Table 1

Parental Responses to Their Children's Misbehavior

Behavior (from most serious to least serious)	Percent who say they: Ignore	Talk	Restrain	Spank	Prevent
Fight with brothers or sisters	0	15.4	38.5	38.5	7.7
Plays wildly	0	25	35	35	5
Losses temper	13	34.8	17.4	34.8	0
Disobeys	4.2	45.8	25	8.3	12.5

Table 2

Parental Values: A Comparison of Kohn's (1964) National Working Class Sample and an Urban Appalachian Working Class Sample (1978)

Porportion who value:	1964	1978
Manners	.22	.47
Success	n.a.*	.29
Honesty	.53	.47
Cleanliness	.16	.35
Judgement	n.a.	.17
Self control	.11	0
Amiability	.15	.23
Obedience	.38	.17
Consideration	.23	.17
Interest	.09	.17
Studiousness	.17	.12
Sex Roles	n.a.	.17

*Kohn's parents were given a slightly different list which excluded several items ultimately included in his later surveys.

Table 3

Percentage of Successfully (SI) and Unsuccessfully (UI) Completed Social Control Interactions By Group Size, Interaction Context and Control Agent

Control Agent	Group Size and Interaction Context: Dyad Teacher & Child		Triad Pegboard Math		Small Group (4-7) Reading & Tablework		Large Group (8+) Announcements		TOTAL	
	SI	UI	SI	UI	SI	UI	SI	UI	SI	UI
Teacher Only	4.5	3.2	13.4	2.5	39.5	29.9	5.1	1.9	62.4 (n=98)	37.6 (n=59)
Teacher and Girl(s)	13.5	3.8	1.9	1.9	48.1	30.8	0.0	0.0	63.5 (n=33)	36.5 (n=19)
Teacher and Boy(s)	2.8	0.0	27.8	5.6	41.7	19.4	0.0	2.8	72.2 (n=26)	27.8 (n=10)
Teacher and Both Boys and Girls	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	55.6	0.0	22.2	22.2 (n= 2)	77.8 (n=7)
Teacher and Unidentified Child	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	33.3 (n= 1)	66.7 (n= 2)